

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,273,137 to Pravorervov et al.

In the Office Action, claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Pravorervov et al.

In the Office Action, claims 3, 4, 7, 10, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pravorervov et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,065,411 to Verness.

In response thereto, claims 14 and 16 have been cancelled, claims 1, 13, 15, and 18 have been amended, and new claims 19 and 20 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-13, 15, and 17-20 are now pending. Following is a discussion of the patentability of each of the pending claims.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a biocompatible, biostable, corrosion-resistant wire strand comprising a core comprising a plurality of electrically conductive, low electrical resistance filaments embedded in an electrically conductive matrix, and a low electrical resistance, substantially chemically inactive cladding discrete from the matrix. As such, the wire strand comprises three discrete components: 1) filaments, 2) matrix, and the 3) cladding. Among the advantages of providing a cladding discrete from the matrix is that an electrical conductive material can be selected for the matrix and a different material that is chemically inactive can be selected for the cladding.

The Pravoverov et al. reference discloses an electrical conductor comprising a flexible braid (2) composed of conductive fibers. The conductive fibers are coiled into a single-thread or multi-thread spiral and placed into an insulating elastic sheath (3).

Each fiber of the braid (2) is a tube (6) made of a corrosion-proof conductive metal or alloy with a filler (7) which is a highly conductive metal or alloy.

The Pravoverov et al. reference does not disclose or suggest a wire strand comprising three discrete components: 1) filaments, 2) matrix, and a 3) cladding. As illustrated in Figure 2 of the Pravoverov et al. reference, the conductive fibers comprise a two component system: 1) a filler (filament), and 2) a tube (matrix) and a sheath, wherein the tube and the sheath comprise the same element. In other words, the tube and sheath are integral such that a compromised material (electrically conductive and chemically inactive) is selected for both the tube and sheath.

The Verness reference discloses leads having conductive wires. In the embodiment illustrated in Figure 4, the wire comprises MP35N alloy or surgical grade stainless steel encasing a silver core in a drawn brazed stranded fabrication process or a drawn filled tube fabrication process.

The Verness reference does not disclose or suggest a wire strand comprising three discrete components: 1) filaments, 2) matrix, and a 3) cladding. As stated previously, the Verness reference comprises a two component system: 1) a matrix made from a silver core, and 2) a cladding made from MP35N or surgical grade stainless steel.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-12

Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1 and are similarly patentable. Furthermore, claim 12 recites that the filaments are braided. The Pravoverov et al. and Verness references do not disclose braided filaments. The Pravoverov et al. discloses fibers comprising fillers (filaments). However, nowhere does the Pravoverov et al. reference disclose that the fillers can be braided. The Verness reference discloses conductive wires having no filaments. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 13

For at least the same reasons discussed above with regards to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 15, 17, and 19

Claims 15, 17, and 19 depend from claim 13 and are similarly patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 18

For at least the same reasons discussed above with regards to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claim 20

Claim 20 depends from claim 18 and is similarly patentable. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

11/4/07
Date


Ronald S. Tamura, Reg. No. 43,179
Patent Attorney for Applicants
818-493-3157

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 36802